

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 TODD MICHAEL SCHULTZ,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 MICHAEL C. THOMPSON, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

No. 2:23-cv-03452-JAK (MRWx)

**ORDER RE EX PARTE MOTION  
FOR EXPEDITED HEARING  
(DKT. 48)**

1 Based on a review of the Ex Parte Motion for Expedited Hearing (the “Motion”  
2 (Dkt. 48)), insufficient good cause has been shown for the requested relief. Therefore,  
3 the Motion is **DENIED**, as follows:

4 No Defendant has moved to dismiss, and it would be premature to set a hearing  
5 date for a motion that has not yet been filed.  
6  
7

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9  
10 Dated: July 31, 2023



11 John A. Kronstadt

12 United States District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28